Page 1.

Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgement.

FORD GREENE,

HUB LAW OFFICES

MAINTHAS, EX STELL VANITUATION LOS CONTINUAROS

EXHIBIT C

072

4

5

6

7

8

9

IO

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

26

This motion is based upon Rules 56(f) and 6(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rules 7.18.1 and 7.3.2.

DATED: November 13, 1990

BY:

FORD GREENE
Attorney for Plaintiffs

DECLARATION OF COUNSEL

FORD GREENE declares:

- 1. I am an attorney licensed to practice law in the Courts of the State of California, the Middle District of California for the United States District Court and am the attorney of record for Vicki J. Aznaran and Richard N. Aznaran, plaintiffs herein.
- 2. On or about October 22, 1990, defendants jointly filed their Notice of Motion and Motion for Summary Judgement with the matter set to be heard on November 19, 1990. The memorandum in support of the motion is 72 pages in length.
- 3. Pursuant to stipulation among the plaintiffs and defendants, filed on or about November 5, 1990, the hearing date was continued to December 3, 1990 and plaintiffs' opposition would be due on November 13, 1990.
- 4. Among a myriad of issues that defendants have raised in their motion is included a challenge to whether the corporate integrity of defendants should be disregarded. Plaintiffs have pleaded that defendants constitute a single entity controlled by one to three individuals and that their respective corporate integrity should be disregarded. In this regard, and for other purposes, plaintiffs have served and are litigating to compel the deposition of David Miscavige, the alleged leader of the Scientology organization.

EXHIBIT_C 073

PLAININGS' MY PARTS APPLICATION FOR CONTINUANCE

Page 2.

Magistrate Eick's ruling is expected this week.

5. Further, I require additional time to obtain the affidavits that are required to raise an issue of fact with respect to the issue of corporate integrity and whether or not it should be penetrated. I have made efforts to obtain such information and evidence over the course of the past three weeks. Additionally, I have endeavored to complete the drafting of plaintiffs' opposition to the 72 page motion.

Compliance With Rule 7.18.1

evidence and complete drafting the opposition of the course of the three day weekend that just passed, however, I was unable to do so. Since on Friday, November 9, 1990, it was my objective to have the opposition filed and served on Tuesday, November 13, 1990. Thus, in light of the fact that I had to provide a courier with the instant application at the outset of the day in order to insure that it would be filed in Los Angeles before the close of the business day, I was unable to contact opposing counsel. Thus, I do not know whether counsel oppose this application or not.

Under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the State of California I hereby declare that the foregoing is true and correct according to my first-hand knowledge, except those matters stated to be on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

Executed on November 13, 1990, at San Anselmo, California

FORD GREENE

EXHIBIT C

POPANDUM OF POINTS AND AU PRITIES

Local Rule 7.18 authorizes making an exparte application. Rule 56(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure authorizes continuing the hearing date on a motion for summary judgement in order to allow the party opposing the motion to obtain affidavits required to defeat the motion. Rule 6 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 7.3.2 authorize bringing a motion for an enlargement of time to respond to a motion.

In the instant case defendants have file a motion the memorandum for which is 72 pages in length; more than twice the number of pages allowed by the local rules without the authorization of the Court. Among the myriad of issues raised therein, plaintiffs must provide evidence justifying their position that the corporate veils of the respective defendants should be penetrated. Plaintiffs require more time both to respond to the size of defendants' motion and to obtain the evidence necessary to successfully resist it.

As Fed.R.Civ.P. 56(f) authorizes the Court to make such rules as are appropriate to the situation of an opposing party requiring additional time to respond, plaintiffs respectfully request that the hearing date be continued to December 17, 1990. In the alternative, pursuant to Rule 6 plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enlarge the time for them to file and serve their opposition to November 19, 1990.

HUB LAW

DATED: November 13, 1990

BY: FORD GREENE

Attorney for Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT_C'

Page 4.

PLAINTIFFS' EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR CONTINUANCE

4154565318 PAGE.205

12

13

14 15

BAM ANGELNO, CALIFORNIA BADGO-1848

FORD GREENE, ESQUING

18

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

I am employed in the County of Marin, State of California. I am
over the age of eighteen years and am not a party to the above
entitled action. My business address is 711 Sir Francis Drake
Boulevard, San Anselmo, California. I served the following
documents: PLAINTIFFS' EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR CONTINUANCE OF HEARING DATE, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO FILE OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT; DECLARATION OF COUNSEL; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES; PROPOSED ORDER
on the following person(s) on the date set forth below, by placing a

on the rollowing person(true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid to be placed in the United States Mail at San Anselmo, California: SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST

[X]	(-1	I caused such envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid to be placed in the united States
		Mail at San Anselmo, California.

- I caused such envelope to be delivered by hand (Personal to the offices of the addressee. Service)
- I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above (State) is true and correct.
- I declare that I am employed in the office of a [X] court at of this the bar member of direction the service was made.

November 13, 1990 DATED:



EXHIBIT C

076

EARLE C. COOLEY

Cooley, Manion, Moore & Jones, P.C. 21 Custom House Street Boston, Massachusetts 02110

ERIC LIBERMAN

13

Arbeitho, California basso-1948 Arbeitho, California basso-1948 (418) 286-0360

PORD GREENE, Exquire

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 25

27

28

Rabinowitz, Boudin, Standard, Krinsky & Lieberman, P.C.

740 Broadway at Astor Place New York, New York 10003-9518

MICHAEL L. HERTZBERG 740 Broadway at Astor Place New York, New York 10003-9518

LAWRENCE E. HELLER Turner, Gerstenfeld, Wilk & Tigerman 8383 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 510 Beverly Hills, California 90211

KENDRICK L. MOXON Bowles & Moxon 6255 Sunset Boulevard, Suite 2000 Hollywood, California 90028

WILLIAM T. DRESCHER 23679 Calabasas Road, Suite 338 Calabasas, California 91302

ALSO BY TELECOPIER THIS DATE

EXHIBIT C'